DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 152 226 IR 005 378

AUTHOR Bagley, Carole A.
TITLE Comprehensive Offender Program Effort. Final Progress Report.
INSTITUTION Minnesota State Dept. of Corrections, St. Paul.
SPONS AGENCY Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (Dept. of Justice), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 77
GRANT 76-ED-05-0025
NOTE 42p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adult Education; Computer Assisted Instruction; *Computer Oriented Programs; *Correctional Education; Corrective Institutions; *Curriculum Development; Educational Games; General Education; *Instructional Design; Tutorial Programs; Vocational Education

ABSTRACT

This report summarizes the year's activities of a project at two adult correctional institutions which utilized computers in their educational programs to supplement the existing GED, basic math, language arts, reading, and vocational skills and awareness curriculums. The computer is used as a supplement to the educational programs by providing drill practice, gaming, and tutorial instructional strategies for each student. Additional instructional strategies are provided by manuals which teachers use in introducing the computers to their students and in deciding which lessons are appropriate for a particular student's level. Students also reference the manuals in conjunction with the GED, curriculum, and machinist training lessons. (Author)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED152226

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

COMPREHENSIVE OFFENDER PROGRAM EFFORT (COPE)

FINAL PROGRESS REPORT

JULY 1 - OCTOBER 31, 1977

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Carole A. Bagley

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

prepared by:

C.A. Bagley
Corrections Project Manager

IR005378

The material in this project was prepared under grant number 76-ED-05-0025 from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. Grantee was the Minnesota Department of Corrections. Subgrantees (Minnesota Educational Computing Consortium) undertaking projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment. Therefore, points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent the official position or policy of the LEAA.

OMB APPROVAL NO. 43-S72R
EXPIRATION DATE 6-30-74

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATION

DISCRETIONARY GRANT
PROGRESS REPORT

GRANTEE	LEAA GRANT NO.	DATE OF REPORT	REPORT NO.
Minnesota Department of Corrections	76-ED-05-0025	October 25, 1977	4

IMPLEMENTING SUBGRANTEE
Minnesota Educational Computing Consortium
2520 Broadway Drive
St. Paul, MN 55113

TYPE OF REPORT
☐ REGULAR QUARTERLY ☐ SPECIAL REQUEST
☒ FINAL REPORT

SHORT TITLE OF PROJECT
Comprehensive Offender Program Effort (COPE)

GRANT AMOUNT

REPORT IS SUBMITTED FOR THE PERIOD July 1 THROUGH September 30, 1977

SIGNATURE OF PROJECT DIRECTOR

TYPED NAME & TITLE OF PROJECT DIRECTOR

COMMENCE REPORT HERE *(Add continuation pages as required.)*

OVERVIEW

During the past year the Stillwater and St. Cloud adult correctional institutions have utilized computers in their educational programs to supplement the existing GED, basic math, language arts, reading, and vocational skills and awareness curriculums. The computer is being used as a supplement to the educational programs by providing drill and practice, gaming and tutorial instructional strategies for each student. Additional instructional strategies are provided by manuals which teachers use in introducing the computers to their students and in deciding which lessons are appropriate for a particular student's level. Furthermore, students reference the manuals in conjunction with the GED, curriculum and machinist training lessons.

A. PROJECT ACTIVITIES RELATED TO GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

During the year, the project progressed as expected. Installation, training, evaluation and other project activities were completed within the expected timeframe and with minor problems. Quarterly reports were written and submitted which described the activities performed during the quarter. This final progress report will attempt to summarize the year's activities with emphasis on the quarter July 1 through September 30, 1977 and will include recommendations and comments for the future.

RECEIVED BY GRANTEE STATE PLANNING AGENCY *(Official)* | DATE

PROGRESS REPORTS--INSTRUCTIONS FOR LEAA DISCRETIONARY GRANTS

Grantees are required to submit Quarterly Progress Reports on project activities and accomplishments. No fixed requirements as to length or detail have been established, although some general guidelines appear below. It is expected that reports will include data appropriate to the stage of project development and in sufficient detail to provide a clear idea and summary of work and accomplishments to date. The following should be observed in preparation and submission of progress reports.

a. Reporting Party. The party responsible for preparing the report will be the agency, whether grantee or subgrantee, actually implementing the project. Thus, where a State Planning Agency is the grantee but has subgranted funds to a particular unit or agency to carry on the project, the report should be prepared by the subgrantee.

b. Due Date. Reports are submitted by the subgrantee to its State Planning Agency on a quarterly basis (i.e., as of June 30, September 30, December 31, and March 31) and are due at the cognizant Regional Office on the 30th day following the close of the quarter (unless specified otherwise by LEAA). The first report will be due after the close of the first full quarter following approval of the grant (i.e., for a grant approval on May 1 the first report will be due for the quarter ending September 30. It will cover the five month period May through September). The award recipient's final progress report will be due 90 days following the close of the project or any extension thereof.

c. Form and Execution. Three (3) copies of each report should be submitted. However, five (5) copies must be submitted for all final reports. (If the grantee wishes to submit the same report to several agencies it may utilize LEAA Form 4587/1 (1-73) as a face sheet completing all items and attach the report to it.) If continuation pages are needed, plain bond paper is to be used. It should be noted that the report is to be signed by the person designated as project director on the grant application or any duly designated successor and reviewed by the cognizant State Planning Agency.

d. Content. Reporting should be non-cumulative and describe only activities and accomplishments occurring during the reporting period. These activities and accomplishments should be described with specific attention to project phases or stages completed (e.g., initial planning stage, completion of preliminary survey effort, purchase of required equipment, staging of pilot training program, etc.). Reports should be concrete and specific concerning accomplishments (e.g., number of people trained, volume of correctional services provided, extent of equipment usage, etc.). Special emphasis should be placed on comparison of actual accomplishments to goals established for the report period. If established goals were not met, reasons for slippage must be given. Special reports, evaluation studies, publications or articles issued during the period should be attached, and major administrative or design developments should be covered (e.g., changes in personnel, changes in project design, improvements or new methods introduced). Budget changes should be touched upon. Problem areas and critical observations should be mentioned and frankly discussed, as well as project successes.

e. Dissemination. All three (3) copies of regular quarterly progress reports and all five (5) copies of final reports should be submitted to the subgrantee's State Planning Agency. After review the State Planning Agency will forward two (2) copies of the quarterly report and four (4) copies of the final report to the cognizant LEAA Regional Office. The Regional Office will route the reports to all interested LEAA units. Copies should also be provided to other agencies cooperating in or providing services to the project.

f. Special Requirements. Special reporting requirements or instructions may be prescribed for discretionary projects in certain program or experimental areas to better assess impact and comparative effectiveness of the overall discretionary program. These will be communicated to affected grantees by LEAA.

OVERVIEW OF THE YEAR'S ACTIVITIES

The project officially began September 1, 1976 and ended October 31, 1977. An implementation plan was designed (Appendix A) which included all major aspects of the project; the equipment installation, testing and maintenance, preparation of contracts with vendors, development of an ongoing support services plan, development of in-service training programs and continuing education, preparation of in-service materials, conducting in-service activities and the formative and summative evaluation testing and interviewing and data analysis.

The project objectives were met by delivering Basic Skills, GED and vocational curriculum via three computer systems, PLATO at the Minnesota State Prison at Stillwater and the Minnesota Educational Computing Consortium (MECC) and Computer Curriculum Corporation (CCC) at the Minnesota State Men's Reformatory at St. Cloud.

A synopsis of the year's activities includes:

1) Negotiating contracts with computer vendors, trainers and support personnel.
2) Installation of telephone and other communications equipment.
3) Installation and testing of computers and terminals.
4) Development and implementation of an ongoing support plan.
5) Development of in-service training materials and an in-service training program.
6) Development and implementation of a formative and summative evaluation plan.
7) Ongoing support of problems occurring at each site.

All instructors at both sites were satisfied with the initial workshops, although all required additional experimentation and familiarization on their own.

The activities proceeded according to the implementation timeline. Although some activities began a little late due to unexpected problems, all have been completed without any major effects to the project.

Each site developed and maintained student schedule logs, problem summaries, weekly time sheets and other on-site materials used by staff and students involved with the Comprehensive Offender Program Effort (COPE) (see Appendix B). These logs, etc. were helpful for the site staff as well as for the site coordinator in diagnosing problems and preventing their reoccurrence and as good organizational procedure. Each site maintained schedules for each student which provided each student and staff with a scheduled time for using the computer. This eliminated many conflicts for students and staff (see Appendix C for sample schedule). The Stillwater schedule is self-explanatory. St. Cloud's schedule was random and therefore, did not have a typical sample schedule.

Throughout the year each site arranged tours and training sessions above and beyond those scheduled for each site by the project coordinator. These tours and sessions were conducted for site staff, parents, computer vendors, parole/probation officers, outside educators, Department of Corrections and Department of Education personnel, the Minnesota governor, state senators and legislators, AVTI-916 visitors, corrections personnel from Alaska and Wisconsin and university students.

QUARTER ACTIVITIES

The fourth quarter activities can be divided into five areas:

I. Site visits and support.

II. Computer-related problems.

III. Project meetings, discussions, demonstrations with sites and/or other Department of Corrections, outside educators, etc. personnel.

a) demonstration and in-service
b) information gathering and/or dissemination
c) preparation for next year

IV. Amount of time spent by students and staff.

V. Evaluation.

I. Site visits to each institution have occurred monthly. These visits have provided the staff with the opportunity to ask questions and solve problems regarding the total project. Problems with the computer, training, evaluation, etc. have been identified and solved more quickly due to these visits. During site visits this quarter interviews of students and teachers have been conducted. Through these interviews and other informal discussions the following items have been raised by each site:

1) Curriculum and system desires for next year.

2) Lesson, computer and terminal errors.

3) Lessons desired for student access.

4) Informal estimations of increased achievement at both institutions and increased motivation at Stillwater.

5) Acknowledgement of increased computer awareness by staff and students.

6) Need to bring in a CCC curriculum specialist for St. Cloud.

7) CCC GED curriculum seems to be better accepted than adult skills curriculum.

8) PLATO adult skills curriculum is better accepted than GED.

Other project support was provided by computer vendors in the areas of technical system support and lesson-courseware support. Each vendor corrected system and courseware errors on a continual basis. Due to the proximity of the Control Data Corporation (CDC) and MECC vendors, they were usually quite prompt in responding to problems. CCC (California) was a bit slower, one to two days, in their response. Since they market the same curriculum on a national basis, some of our errors were not corrected until a common update was done (twice a year). The MECC instructional services division consulted with St. Cloud regarding programming and general computer topics.

● II. Computer-related problems this quarter have included lesson and system errors, terminal malfunctions and computer down-time. Letters were addressed to each vendor in an attempt to eliminate and/or hasten the correction process. The disk switching problem which occurred last quarter for St. Cloud was alleviated by maintaining the adult disk only. Courseware was corrected in a reasonable amount of time. CCC further sent a curriculum specialist to explain certain operations which were not completely understood by site staff at St. Cloud.

● III. In addition to demonstrations and tours arranged by site staff, the project coordinator initiated the following meetings:

1) Informal question/answer session to discuss MECC curriculum library at St. Cloud.
2) A career counselling workshop held in the spring for St. Cloud-DVR (Division of Vocational Rehabilitation) staff.
3) Programming consultation for St. Cloud.
4) Informal discussion with CCC curriculum consultant for St. Cloud.

5) Meeting for all sites at MECC to familiarize each site with all computers and to discuss next year's possibilities.

6) Demonstration for Department of Corrections Commissioner and other key personnel and discussion of the project's future.

7) Discussions with both sites as to next year's funding possibilities and terminal placement.

8) Discussions with both sites on development of new curriculum for next year.

●IV. The time spent by each site this quarter decreased due to the familiarity with procedures on part of both students and staff. The St. Cloud site coordinator spent approximately 35 hours and the Stillwater site coordinator spent approximately 595 hours. The minimal amount of time spent by St. Cloud was due to the lack of involvement on the part of the Education area. The DVR people were extremely responsive. The time indicated is 90 percent DVR. Total time spent by other site staff at St. Cloud Education was not reported, DVR was approximately 130 hours and for Stillwater was 255 hours. Total number of students currently accessing the computers at St. Cloud is 25 DVR-St. Cloud and unknown-Education-St. Cloud and at Stillwater is 81 students.

●V. The evaluation progressed with some expected problems. The extra work required of each instructor was a common cause for complaint. All testing has been completed as of July 1. The data has been analyzed and will be produced and disseminated shortly.

ATTITUDES

Attitudes were reflected through on-site student and staff interviews and via informal telephone conversations and questionnaires with the site coordinator. Furthermore, a site visit observation log was completed during each visit by the project coordinator (see Appendix E).

Typical attitudes expressed by students include:

"It's boring"
"It cheated me"
"It ripped me off"
"It made a mistake again"
"This is neat"
"I beat it again"
"I got to get my score up again, because I got knocked off the hall of fame."
"Would you get me some harder stuff for the computer?"
"Does it hear me talk?"
"I finished...."
"I'm doing better now"
"I really like Quest"
"Sure give you a lot of information" (MOIS)
"Does this thing know all about me?"
"These are really great. How can I get one in my home for my kid?"
"Can I come in after school to make up my computer time?"
"I hope they never get the idea to use these instead of teachers."

Several students have been determined to look up PLATO on the streets. One student transferring to the AVTI-916 said he was going to get on their and keep communicating with Stillwater via PLATO.

Students often pushed incorrect keys due to unfamiliarity and/or tedium. Some students would swear at the machine and accuse it of cheating. Many frustrations occurred when the terminals malfunctioned, because it meant that the student would have to start over on another terminal.

Several students really "got into" the games with their top scores listed in the "Hall of Fame". They shared techniques to improve time, etc. with one another. Clever responses of the machine to their correct answers caused some of them to call others to share the humor.

The project coordinator and site coordinators felt that the project year was successful at Stillwater and St. Cloud-DVR in terms of meeting project time schedules, successfully implementing and interweaving the

computers into the educational program and providing an innovative and motivating instructional medium. Continuation funds will allow the sites to continue offering CAI and other federal monies are being obtained to develop additional curriculum to be delivered via the computers. The St. Cloud Education CAI project was for the most part unsuccessful due to the lack of cooperation from the administration. Attitudes expressed during the year can best be summarized by the site coordinator at Stillwater, Eileen Welsh.

> PLATO brought a new dimension to the education program. The experience of this type of delivery system was fascinating as well as helpful. It brought initial enthusiasm (primarily for the delivery system) and later on assistance with subject material. English and math lessons were used most.
>
> Problem areas:
>
> 1. Lessons were programmed in such a way that students who did not finish a lesson one day had to go through the entire lesson the following day.
> 2. Errors in responses (in the programming) made it impossible for students to proceed.
> 3. Periods of time when PLATO was down frequently caused frustration problems.
> 4. Too many visitors made students using PLATO uncomfortable--some quit, some got upset.
> 5. Generally the curriculum is considered poor--a collection of programs with different language (non-uniform) as opposed to curriculum developed to include pre and posttests, cross strand references, continuing where you left off, moving ahead, moving back for more reinforcement and review when needed, etc.
>
> PLATO was as useful/helpful to us as another teaching tool--(video tape, cassette programs, etc.). With creative teachers, it served a much better purpose than with those who didn't select programs carefully or correlate the lessons on PLATO with their other learning programs.
>
> I question its cost effectiveness in the long run.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the experiences of this year and on the feedback from each site, the following recommendations are made by the project coordinator:

1) A minimum of two months should be allowed for telephone installation. The telephone company should be prompted to inspect the institution very early to insure that the timeline will be met.

2) Since state purchasing procedures are extremely time consuming, it is necessary to order all equipment a minimum of two months before it will be needed.

3) To reduce the numbers of people involved in decision-making, the project direction responsibility should be given to one person who is a CAI specialist and is located in the central office of the Department of Corrections. Outside consultants should be obtained to provide curriculum, computer, evaluation and other areas of expertise.

4) Each site should have a one-half-time site coordinator who is familiar with computers as an instructional medium. This person should be located on site to handle all problems, schedule students, train staff and to monitor the project. These people would report to the project director.

5) The project evaluator should be an outside evaluator reporting to the project director for summative evaluation only. Formative data should be provided to the project director via interviews, site visits, site coordinator time and problem logs, telephone, etc.

6) Close communication with sites prior to implementation (perhaps at proposal time) regarding the proposed project is necessary to insure cooperation among project staff.

PROGRESS TOWARD ACHIEVING COMPLIANCE WITH "SPECIAL CONDITIONS FOR THE PROJECT"

Activities undertaken this quarter include:

1) Preparation and submission of the third quarterly progress report.

2) Preparation and submission of the fourth and final progress report.

B. OTHER ACTIVITIES NOT DIRECTLY RELATED TO GOALS

1) Demonstrations and discussions with Minnesota Department of Corrections Commissioner Schoen, Corrections personnel from California and educators in Minnesota for the purposes of familiarizing them with COPE activities.

2) The submission and acceptance of a curriculum development proposal intended to be used for developing new courseware for the correctional education environment.

3) Development and dissemination of a needs assessment form from which priority curriculum areas were selected to begin development on July 1, 1977.

C. PROBLEMS

A summary of problems occurring this quarter include:

1) Changes of computer passwords with proper notification to sites.

2) Technical failure of message capability for certain site staff utilizing PLATO.

3) Terminal failures--touch panels, light print, scrolling effect.

4) Communication problems at both sites causing poor transmission and reception.

5) Communication failure with CCC computer--no response at sites when phone dialed.

6) New PCP system update for PLATO system to have been received prior to this quarter. It was received in August.

7) Lesson errors occurred regularly on the PLATO system.

8) Misunderstanding of how the CCC diagnostic and placement routine worked.

9) Database errors in CCC curriculum.

All problems have been alleviated at this time by bringing out-state consultants to the sites, additional training, letters to vendors and via telephone conversations with the appropriate people.

D. POSITIONS FILLED DURING THE QUARTER

A part-time, temporary programmer from the University of Minnesota, Terry Belcher, was hired to convert some programs to the PLATO system. These programs are currently being accessed by staff at the Stillwater State Prison.

There were no other personnel appointments during this quarter.

APPENDIX A

COMPREHENSIVE OFFENDER PROGRAM EFFORT (COPE)

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

COMPREHENSIVE OFFENDER PROGRAM EFFORT (COPE)

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

The Comprehensive Offender Program Effort (COPE) project was funded by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) in an attempt to improve inmates basic skills at the Stillwater State Prison and St. Cloud Reformatory and to provide vocational counseling at the St. Cloud Reformatory.

The implementation plan was designed during September by the project coordinator. The plan was designed to meet the following project goals for teachers and students at each institution:

I. Stillwater State Prison

A. Teachers

1. Teachers will have a basic knowledge of computer uses in education.

2. Teachers will have a working level knowledge of the mathematics, language arts and other curriculum packages.

3. Teachers will have an understanding of how to use a computer terminal and how to teach students to use the terminal.

4. Teachers will have an understanding of the enrollment procedures which are required when entering a new student into the computer-based curriculum.

5. Teachers will be able to effectively integrate the computer-based curriculum into already existing curriculums.

B. Students

1. Students will acquire increased motivation for learning.

2. Students will acquire increased achievement levels in mathematics and language arts.

3. Students will increase their chances for passing the G.E.D. exam through the use of the computer-based G.E.D. materials.

II. St. Cloud Reformatory

A. Teachers

1. Teachers will have a basic knowledge of computer uses in education.

2. Teachers will have a working level knowledge of the mathematics, reading, G.E.D. and vocational awareness computer-based curriculum.

3. Teachers will have an understanding of how to use a computer terminal and how to teach students to use the terminal.

4. Teachers will have an understanding of the enrollment procedures which are required when entering a new student into the computer-based curriculum.

5. Teachers will be able to effectively integrate the computer-based curriculum into already existing curriculums.

6. Teachers will have access to computer-based instructional applications in numerous subject areas.

7. Teachers will be made aware of activities and courses which can be taken for credit at various higher education institutions.

B. Students

1. Students will acquire increased motivation for learning.

2. Students will gain additional awareness of vocational alternatives and skills.

3. Students will acquire increased achievement levels in mathematics and reading.

4. Students will increase their chances for passing the G.E.D. exam through the use of the computer-based G.E.D. materials.

The total project implementation plan consists of the following components:

I. Conceptualization and Design of Implementation Schedule

II. Development of Implementation Details Including In-Service Training Documents and Daily Activity Log

III. Implement the Plan Including Training and Site Visits

IV. Evaluate

The design phase took place in September, the development of the implementation details began in September and will continue through October, the implementation of the project began in September with the addition of communications equipment to the already existing Computer Curriculum Corporation (CCC) computer at the MECC site. The Control Data Corporation (CDC) computer being used in this project (from the Minnesota Corrections Computer Project--MCCP), also known as PLATO, has been available at the Arden Hills site prior to the inception of this project. The implementation of the project will continue through October, 1977 as is indicated by the project timeline on the following page.

The evaluation phase will be performed on a continuous basis to obtain formative feedback and at the start and finish to obtain the summative data.

COMPREHENSIVE OFFENDER PROGRAM EFFORT (COPE)

TIME SCHEDULE

1976
1977
SEPT 6 13 20 27
OCT 4 11 18 25
NOV 1 8 15 22 29
DEC 6 13 20 27
JAN 3 10 17 24 31
FEB 7 14 21 28
MARCH 7 14 21 28
APRIL 4 11 18 25
MAY 2 9 16 23 30
JUNE 6 13 20 27
JULY 4 11 18 25
AUGUST 1 8 15 22 29
SEPT 5 12 19
OCT 3 10 17
Contract Finalized
Operational & Evaluation Plan Developed
Introductory Visits with St. Cloud and Stillwater Personnel
Development of Formative qualitative and quantitative measurement instruments
Communications Equipment Installed
Computer Terminals Installed
Delivery of Curriculum
Introduction of Teachers to Use of Computers in Education by UECC
Curriculum Workshops by CCC and PLATO for Teachers and Facilitators
Follow-up Instruction with Teachers--St. Cloud and Stillwater
Begin Student Use of Computer-Based Instruction
Evaluative Testing: WIAT pre & post attitudinal interviews, etc. pre & post
Development of Summative Plan
On-going Support of Teachers

TOP = CCC St. Cloud BOTTOM = PLATO Stillwater

The implementation schedules on the following pages were developed and disseminated to the appropriate personnel at each correctional institution.

Included are:

I. An outline of the implementation details for the months of September and October for St. Cloud.

II. An outline of the implementation details for the month of September and October for Stillwater.

III. Overview of Computer Uses in Education pre-session schedule for St. Cloud and Stillwater.

IV. Facilitator's workshop for St. Cloud.

V. Curriculum workshop for St. Cloud.

VI. Facilitator's workshop outline for Stillwater.

VII. Curriculum workshop for Stillwater.

8/17/76

I.

COMPREHENSIVE OFFENDER PROGRAM EFFORT (COPE)

St. Cloud State Reformatory

Implementation Schedule

Six terminals delivered and a report printer	September 6
Phone lines installed	September 15
Introduction to Computers in Education workshop at MECC	September 20
Six terminals installed and report printer	September 22
Facilitator's workshop	September 22
Curriculum workshop	September 29
Students to begin use of curriculum	October 4
Formative evaluation and data collection for summative evaluation to commence on . . .	October 4
Site visits by staff to commence on . . .	October 4

9/16/76

II.

COMPREHENSIVE OFFENDER PROGRAM EFFORT (COPE)

Stillwater State Prison

Implementation Schedule

Communications equipment installed	September 3
Five terminals delivered	September 6
Phone lines installed by (to be handled by site and billed to corrections central office)	September 10
Five terminals installed	September 15
Introduction to Computers in Education workshop at MECC	September 20
Curriculum workshop	October 18, 19
Facilitator's workshop	October 20
Students to begin use of curriculum	October 25
Formative evaluation and data collection for summative evaluation to commence on . . .	October 25
Site visits by staff to commence on . . .	October 25

9/10/76

III. COMPREHENSIVE OFFENDER PROGRAM EFFORT (COPE)

Stillwater
St. Cloud

OVERVIEW OF COMPUTER USES IN EDUCATION

Pre-session Schedule

September 20

I. Introduction (Room 128) . . . . . 8:30 - 9:30 a.m.

A. Project Overview - Carole Bagley (MECC)
B. Discussion of Today's Activities - Carole Bagley
C. Evaluation Overview

II. Overview of Educational Usage of Computers . . . . 9:30 - 10:15 a.m.
(Room 128) - Dan Klassen (MECC)

A. K-Graduate School Usage
B. Administrative
C. Instructional
D. Research and Development

* * * * * * * * * * * BREAK 10:15 - 10:30 a.m. * * * * * * * * * * * * *

III. Three Instructional Systems Being Used in . . . . . 10:30 - 11:20 a.m.
Correctional Institutions (Classroom)

A. MECC - Linda Borry (MECC)
B. PLATO - Control Data Corporation
C. CCC

* * * * * * * * * * LUNCH 11:20 a.m. - 12:45 p.m. * * * * * * * * * * *

IV. Demonstrations of Various Curriculum Packages . . . . . 1 - 4 p.m.

Group I

A. Elementary/Secondary Use of Computers in . . . . 1 - 1:45 p.m.
Instruction - Linda Borry (Classroom)
B. Higher Education - Carole Bagley . . . . . 1:45 - 2:30 p.m.
Kevin Hausmann (MECC)
(Classroom)
C. Vocational - GIS (Guidance Information System) . . 2:30 - 3:15 p.m.
Kevin Hausmann (MECC) (Room 128)
D. Vocational - MOIS (Minnesota Occupational . . . . 3:15 - 4 p.m.
Information System) - Emily Lemon (Minnesota
State Department of
Occupational Information)
(Room 128)

Group II

A. Vocational - (Room 128) . . . . . 1 - 1:45 p.m.
B. Vocational - MOIS (Room 128) . . . . . 1:45 - 2:30 p.m.
C. Elementary/Secondary (Classroom) . . . . . 2:30 - 3:15 p.m.
D. Higher Education (Classroom) . . . . . 3:15 - 4 p.m.

V. Wrap-up Session (Room 128) . . . . . 4 - 4:05 p.m.

IV.

COMPREHENSIVE OFFENDER PROGRAM EFFORT (COPE)

ST. CLOUD REFORMATORY

Facilitator's Workshop

September 22

12:30 - 3:30 p.m.

Terminal Management	12:30 - 1 p.m.
Curriculum Maintenance	1 - 1:30 p.m.
Student Enrollment Procedures	1:30 - 3:30 p.m.

V.

COMPREHENSIVE OFFENDER PROGRAM EFFORT (COPE)

ST. CLOUD REFORMATORY

Curriculum Workshop

September 29

8:30 a.m. - 4:30 p.m.

Computer Curriculum Corporation (CCC)

Sign on/off procedures Keyboard and terminal features	8:30 - 9:30 a.m.
Adult arithmetic curriculum	9:30 - 10:30 a.m.
Adult reading curriculum	10:30 - 11:30 a.m.
Student and teacher reports	11:30 a.m. - 12 noon
Lunch	12 noon - 1:30 p.m.
G.E.D. curriculum	1:30 - 3:30 p.m.
G.E.D. reports	3:30 - 4:30 p.m.

Minnesota Educational Computing Consortium (MECC)

Sign on/off procedures Keyboard and terminal features	8:30 - 9:30 a.m.
Math applications	9:30 - 10:00 a.m.
Science applications	10:00 - 10:30 a.m.
Social Studies applications	10:30 - 11:00 a.m.
Other curriculum applications	11:00 a.m. - 12 noon
Lunch	12 noon - 1:30 p.m.
Guidance Information System (GIS)	1:30 - 2:30 p.m.
Minnesota Occupational Information System (MOIS)	2:30 - 3:30 p.m.
Other vocational skills packages	3:30 - 4:30 p.m.

VI.

COMPREHENSIVE OFFENDER PROGRAM EFFORT (COPE)

STILLWATER STATE PRISON

Facilitator's Workshop

October 20

12 noon - 4 p.m.

Enrollment of Students	12 noon - 4 p.m.
Instructor Problems	
Terminal Management	

VII.

COMPREHENSIVE OFFENDER PROGRAM EFFORT (COPE)

STILLWATER STATE PRISON

Curriculum Workshop

October 18, 19

9 a.m. - 4 p.m.

October 18

Introduction and formal orientation to PLATO Keyboard introduction General curriculum overview	9 a.m. - 12 noon
Lunch	12 noon - 1 p.m.
Student mode training Sign on/off Browse through index of topics How to use PLATO lessons Math/language arts curriculum	1 - 4 p.m.

October 19

Instructor mode training Site director Instructor Instructor aide Students	9 a.m. - 12 noon
Lunch	12 noon - 1 p.m.
Time to browse through curriculum	1 - 4 p.m.

Additional implementation include a daily activity log, a site visit observation log, and a site coordinator time and problem log. This information will provide the project coordinator with formative data so that the project may be revised as necessary. Copies are provided on the following pages.

As the project progresses it will be necessary for the MECC project staff to visit the institutions on a regular basis. During the first month following the student start date, more frequent visits will be made in order to avoid crucial problems. The following scheduled visits per week or month have been arranged for MECC project staff. These visits are in addition to any trips which may evolve sporadically.

	Stillwater	St. Cloud
October 18	2	2
October 25	2	2
November 1	2	2
November 8	2	2
November 15	1	1
November 22	1	1
November 29	1	1
December 6	1	1
December 13	1	1
January	1	1
February	1	1
March	1	1
April	1	1
May	1	1
June	1	1
July	1	1
August	1	1
September	1	1
October	1	1

FIELD SERVICES STAFF

The following information must be recorded on a daily log so that adequate progress reports can be submitted to the federal foundation. The Minnesota Department of Corrections requires weekly updates as well. It would be most helpful if you could be as specific as possible. Please return to Carole within a few days following the activity.

NAME _____

DATE _____

Morning _____ Afternoon _____
Evening _____

ACTIVITY _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

TEACHER REMARKS _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

STUDENT REACTIONS _____

PROBLEMS _____

ACTIVITY REQUESTED BY: INSTITUTION _____ DATE REQUESTED _____

IF INSTITUTION - WHO REQUESTED _____

PROJECT SPECIFICATIONS _____

DEFINITION OF PROBLEM _____

DATE SOLVED _____

(over)

SITE VISIT OBSERVATION LOG

Please complete the following information during your site visit.

1) Site Name _____

Date _____

2) For Site Coordinator:

Does he feel that teachers are enthusiastic?	YES	NO
Does he feel that students are enthusiastic?	YES	NO
Does he feel that the project is running smoothly?	YES	NO
Does he have any immediate computer problems which need to be solved? If so please list: _____	YES	NO
Does he feel that problems are solved in a reasonable amount of time?	YES	NO
Are there any administrative problems? If yes, please list:	YES	NO

3) For Instructors:

Are they confortable with the system? PLATO-MECC-CCC	YES	NO
Do they need to spend more time becoming familiar with aspects of the system?	YES	NO
Do they have any suggestions for lessons which might be developed? If yes, please list: _____	YES	NO

Do they feel that students are learning anything by using CAI? YES NO

Do they feel that students are more motivated to learn due to CAI? YES NO

Do they feel the PLATO-MECC-CCC lessons are meeting their curriculum needs? YES NO

Any Comments: _____

_____

_____

_____

4) For Students:

Are they enthusiastic? YES NO

Which lessons do they enjoy most? (PLATO sites only)

_____

_____

Do they find this method of learning to be more difficult than traditional instruction? YES NO

easier? YES NO

Would they like to use the system more? YES NO

less? YES NO

Do they feel they are learning faster because of CAI? YES NO

Any Comments: _____

_____

_____

_____

8/17/76

SITE COORDINATOR

TIME AND PROBLEM LOG

(To be completed weekly)

Name _____

Site _____

Date _____

Total time spent by site coordinator _____

A. Time spent with familiarization _____

B. Time spent teaching staff _____

C. Time spent with students _____

D. Administration, scheduling _____

Total time spent by Basic Ed teachers with the CAI project _____

Total number of students using CAI at this time _____

Problems _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX B

Site Time and Problem Log

8/17/76

SITE COORDINATOR

TIME AND PROBLEM LOG

(To be completed weekly)

Name _____

Site _____

Date _____

Total time spent by site coordinator _____

A. Time spent with familiarization _____

B. Time spent teaching staff _____

C. Time spent with students _____

D. Administration, scheduling _____

Total time spent by Title I teachers with the CAI project _____

Total number of students using CAI at this time _____

Problems _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX C

SAMPLE STUDENT SCHEDULE

STILLWATER

MONDAY thru THURSDAY

PLATO

	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
	Perez ABE	Meyers GED	Teboy Voc	Clough GED	Dotseth GED
	Leal ABE	Ruiz GED	Lauderville GED	Zieman ABE	Ansette GED
	Radunz ABE	McEvans GED	Henry GED	Brushi GED	Teetzel GED
	Francisco ABE	Ellis GED	Hammick ABE	Reinke GED	Jones GED
	********** REST and RELAXATION **********				
	Moncada ABE	Prahosh GED	Burton GED	Holmes GED	Michaud GED
	Prudhomme ABE	Remlinger GED	Everson GED	Nicholls ABE	Joyner GED
	********** EVENING CLASSES **********				
	X	Radunz	McCormack	Kelly	Tucker GED
	X	Olson	Rodriguez	O'Neill	Thomason
	X	Glover	Fuentes	Townsend	Page
	X	Gruber	Quitberg	Hamilton	Boldt GED

Ms Eileen Welch

Bob Cavegn

APPENDIX D

Sample Student Schedule

St. Cloud

STUDENT SCHEDULE

St. Cloud Education: Not Available

St. Cloud-DVR: Assigned students on individual basis, therefore, no schedule available.

APPENDIX E

Site Visit Observation Log

SITE VISIT OBSERVATION LOG

Please complete the following information during your site visit.

1) Site Name _____

Date _____

2) For Site Coordinator:

Does she/he feel that teachers are enthusiastic? YES NO

Does she/he feel that students are enthusiastic? YES NO

Does she/he feel that the project is running smoothly? YES NO

Does she/he have any immediate computer problems which need to be solved? If so, please list: YES NO _____

_____

_____

Does she/he feel that problems are solved in a reasonable amount of time? YES NO

Are there any administrative problems? If yes, please list: YES NO

_____

_____

_____

3) For Instructors:

Are they confortable with the system? PLATO-MECC-CCC YES NO

Do they need to spend more time becoming familiar with aspects of the system? YES NO

Do they have any suggestions for lessons which might be developed? If yes, please list: YES NO _____

_____

_____

Do they feel that students are learning anything by using CAI? YES NO

Do they feel that students are more motivated to learn due to CAI? YES NO

Do they feel the PLATO-MECC-CCC lessons are meeting their curriculum needs? YES NO

Any Comments: _____

_____

_____

_____

4) For Students:

Are they enthusiastic? YES NO

Which lessons do they enjoy most?
(PLATO sites only)

_____

_____

Do they find this method of learning to be more difficult than traditional instruction? YES NO

easier? YES NO

Would they like to use the system more? YES NO

less? YES NO

Do they feel they are learning faster because of CAI? YES NO

Any Comments: _____

_____

_____

_____